UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,657	10/23/2003	Steven R. Ligon	SAIC0080-US	5863

75131 7590 07/24/2008

KING & SPALDING LLP (SAIC CUSTOMER NUMBER)
ATTN: GEORGE T. MARCOU
1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW
SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
MANSFIELD, THOMAS L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/690,657	LIGON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THOMAS MANSFIELD	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Final Office action is in reply to the Response to Office Action filed on 24 April 2008.

2. Claims 7, 9, and 15 have been amended.

3. Claims 1-18 are currently pending and have been examined.

Specification

4. The objection to the disclosure is withdrawn because Applicants have deleted the embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable code.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 24 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. Applicant submits that Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) does not teach in amended Claim 1, and Claims 6 and 7: (1) *at least one maturity model on a display, receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table; with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model stored in a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table* [see Remarks page 12, second paragraph].

7. Applicant submits that Skoyles-Greenberg in view of Aycock et al (U.S. 5,765,138) does not teach or suggest in Claim 2: (2) *at least one maturity model on a display, receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table; with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model stored in a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table* [see Remarks page 15, third paragraph].

8. Applicant submits that Skoyles-Greenberg in view of Baudoin et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0010709) does not teach or suggest in Claims 3 and 4: (3) *at least one maturity model on a display, receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table; with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model stored in a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table* [see Remarks page 17, second paragraph].

9. Applicant submits that Skoyles-Greenberg in view of Baudoin and in further view of Balz et al (U.S. 7,136,792) does not teach or suggest in Claims 5, and 8-18: (4) *at least one maturity model on a display, receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table; with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model stored in a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table* [see Remarks page 18, last paragraph through page 18, top of page].

10. With regard to arguments 1-4, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Skoyles-Greenberg teaches *at least one maturity model on a display* (Operation Maturity Model (OMM) assessment, displaying the costs and time corresponding to each stage of a project along with each task) (see at least page 2, line 13 through page 3, line 15), *receiving generalized work products through a user interface* (standardized interfaces) (see at least page 9, lines 3-26) *and storing the generalized work products in a first table; with a computer processor* (Software Engineering Institute's (SEI) software CMM) (see at least page 5, line 23 through page 7, line 24 and page 9, lines 3-26), *relating the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model stored in a*

second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table (work product list) (see at least page 10, line 17 through page 11, line 27). The Examiner also notes that providing an automatic or mechanical (including computerized) means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art (see MPEP 2144.04 [R-6], III. Automating a Manual Activity, *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1).

Regarding to claim 1, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Skoyles-Greenberg discloses a method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model (page 2, lines 14-18) comprising: establishing work products (page 2, line 25); relating individual requirements of the at least one maturity model (i.e. operations maturity model) to the work products (page 11, lines 28-31); tracing the work products to the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model (page 11, lines 17-18, page 12, lines 8-9); and providing an indicator of the approximate maturity of the company in view of the at least one maturity model (page 6, lines 7-9, page 14, lines 18-20). However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not explicitly disclose generalized and company-specific work products. Andersen Consulting L.L.P. discloses a work product list (page 12, lines 5-6) to comprise a category and function assessment list of the products (i.e. page 10, lines 13-14). It is common knowledge in the prior art for the work product list to include generalized and company specific work products.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the method for approximating the maturity of a company as taught by Skoyles-Greenberg to include establishing generalized work products; relating individual requirements of the at least one maturity model to the generalized work products; providing company-specific work products; associating at least some of the company-specific work products with at least some of the generalized work products, tracing the company-specific work products to the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model through the association of the at least some company-specific work products with at least some the generalized work products; and providing an indicator of the approximate maturity of the company in view of the at least one maturity model as taught by Skoyles-Greenberg The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model based on generalized and company-specific work products.

Regarding to claims 6 and 7, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not explicitly disclose wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is provided in a report and the report includes a list of the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model that were not traceable to at least one of the company-specific work products (as per claim 6) and wherein report further includes a list of company-specific work products that were not associated with the generalized work products (as per claim 7). Skoyles-Greenberg discloses identifying and resolving gaps (i.e. gap analysis) (page 15, lines12-15) and producing an assessment report (page 16, lines 16-17 and 23-24). It is common knowledge in the prior for the assessment report to provide the indicator of approximate maturity (page 6, lines 7-9, page 14, lines 18-20) and for the gap analysis to list individual requirements of the at least one maturity model that were not traceable to at least one of the company-specific work products (as per claim 6) and wherein report further includes a list of company-specific work products that were not associated with the generalized work products (as per claim 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the method of Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is provided in a report and the report includes a list of the individual requirements of the at least one maturity model that were not traceable to at least one of the company-specific work products (as per claim 6) and wherein report further includes a list of company-specific work products that were not associated with the generalized work products (as per claim 7) as taught by Skoyles-Greenberg. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a report for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model for individual requirements that were not traceable to at least one of the company-specific work products.

14. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) in view of Aycock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,138).

Regarding to claim 2, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not disclose wherein the maturity of the company is approximated in view of at least two maturity models, wherein the individual requirements of the at least two maturity models are related to the generalized work products. Aycock et al. discloses selecting quality maturity requirements from at least two models (i.e. standards) in accordance with project requirements (column 5, lines 44-47 and 60-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the maturity of the company is approximated in view of at least two maturity models, wherein the individual requirements of the at least two maturity models are related to the generalized work products as taught by Aycock et el. as both Skoyles-Greenberg and Aycock et al. are directed to the method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity of a company based on different requirements.

15. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) in view of Baudoin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0010709 A1).

Regarding to claim 3, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not disclose wherein the at least one maturity model includes multiple levels of maturity. Baudoin et al. discloses multiple levels of maturity (paragraph [0022], lines 3-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Andersen Consulting L.L.P. wherein the at least one maturity model includes multiple levels of maturity taught by Baudoin et al., as both Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. are directed to the method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to define the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model from least mature to most mature.

Regarding to claim 4, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not disclose wherein the indicator of the approximate maturity is indicative of the highest of the multiple levels of maturity attained by the company. Baudoin et al. discloses recording the highest maturity level for requirements (paragraph [0026], lines 7-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the indicator of the approximate maturity is indicative of the highest of the multiple levels of maturity attained by the company as taught by Baudoin et al. as both Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. are directed to the method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the most mature level attained by the company.

16. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) in view of Baudoin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0010709 A1) and further in view of Balz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,136,792 B2).

Regarding to claim 5, Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. do not disclose wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is a percentage. Balz et al. discloses assessing approximate maturity based on a percentage score (see FIG. 1, column 4, lines 6-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is a percentage as taught by Balz et al., as Skoyles-Greenberg, Baudoin et al. and Balz et al. are directed to the method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the approximate the level of maturity based on percentage.

17. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) in view of Balz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,136,792 B2).

Regarding to claim 8, Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Skoyles-Greenberg does not disclose wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is a percentage. Balz et al. discloses assessing approximate maturity based on a percentage score (see FIG. 1, column 4, lines 6-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the indicator of approximate maturity is a percentage as taught by Balz et al., as Skoyles-Greenberg and Balz et al. are directed to the method for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the approximate the level of maturity based on percentage.

18. Claims 9-12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,138) and in view of Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1).

Regarding to claim 9, Aycock et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Aycock et al. discloses a method for using a maturity tracing system in order to determine the approximate maturity level of an organization in view of at least one maturity model comprising: entering data indicative of work products into the maturity tracing system through a user interface (column 10, lines 39-42); associating (i.e. competitive analysis) at least some of the work products with at least some of the pre-existing work products provided on the maturity tracing system through the user interface (column 10, lines 5-11 and 62-67); requesting (i.e. download) the tracing of the work products to maturity requirements for the at least one maturity model through the user interface, wherein the maturity tracing system includes at least one application for relating the pre-existing work products to the maturity requirements for the at least one maturity model (column 10, lines 55-57 and 62-67); and requesting a report indicating the approximate maturity level of the organization in view of at least one maturity model through the user interface (column 11, lines 57-62). However, Aycock et al. does not explicitly disclose organization-specific and generalized work products. Skoyles-Greenberg discloses a work product list (page 12, lines 5-6) to comprise a category and function assessment list of the products (i.e. page 10, lines 13-14). It is common knowledge in the prior art for the work product list to include organization-specific and generalized work products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for to combine the method of Aycock et al. with the feature of entering data indicative of organization-specific work products into the maturity tracing system through a user interface; associating at least some of the organization-specific work products with at least some of the pre-existing generalized work products provided on the maturity tracing system through the user interface; requesting the tracing of the organization-specific work products to maturity requirements for the at least one

maturity model through the user interface, wherein the maturity tracing system includes at least one application for relating the pre-existing generalized work products to the maturity requirements for the at least one maturity model; and requesting a report indicating the approximate maturity level of the organization in view of at least one maturity model through the user interface as taught by Skoyles-Greenberg as both Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg are directed to the method for using a maturity tracing system in order to determine the approximate maturity level of an organization in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity level of an organization in view of at least one maturity model based organization-specific and generalized work products.

Regarding to claim 10, Aycock et al. discloses including querying text (i.e. selectively access) indicative of at least one of the pre-existing generalized work products and the maturity requirements for the at least one maturity model in order to ascertain description information therefore (column 10, lines 62-67).

Regarding to claim 11, Aycock et al. discloses wherein the description information is provided in a pop up window (i.e. secondary display window) on the user interface (column 14, lines 47-55, see FIG. 6).

Regarding to claim 12, Aycock et al. discloses wherein the description information is provided through a hyperlink (i.e. icon) to an information screen on the user interface (column 13, lines 61-64, column 14, lines 47-53).

Regarding to claim 14, Aycock et al. discloses wherein the maturity of the organization is approximated in view of at least two maturity models (i.e. standards) (column 5, lines 44-47 and 60-65).

Regarding to claim 15, Aycock et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Aycock et al. discloses a system for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model (column 2, lines 38-41) comprising: means for storing data representative of work products (i.e. specifications), data representative of individual requirements for the at least one maturity model (column 2, lines 49-52, column 3, lines 44-46); at least one database (i.e. product database) for relating work products to the data representative of individual requirements for the at least one maturity model (column 9, lines 59-62 and 64-67); and an application (i.e. interface) for a user to access the databases and an indicator of the approximate maturity of the company in view of the at least one maturity model (column 11, lines 17-20) However, Aycock et al. does not explicitly disclose generalized and company-specific work products and an application for prompting the association of the data representative of the company- specific work products to the data representative of generalized work products; an application for tracing the data representative of the company-specific work products to the data representative of individual requirements for the at least one maturity model; and an application for providing an indicator of the approximate maturity of the company in view of the at least one maturity model. Skoyles-Greenberg discloses a work product list (page 12, lines 5-6) to comprise a category and function assessment list of the products (i.e. page 10, lines 13-14). It is common knowledge in the prior art for the work product list to include generalized and company specific work products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Aycock et al. with the feature of storing data representative of generalized work products, data representative of individual requirements for the at least one maturity model and data representative of the company-specific work products; at least one relationship database for relating the data representative of generalized work products to the data representative of individual requirements for the at least one maturity model; an application for prompting the association of the data representative of the company-specific work products to the data representative of generalized work products; an application for tracing the data representative of the company-specific work products to the data representative of individual

requirements for the at least one maturity model; and an application for providing an indicator of the approximate maturity of the company in view of the at least one maturity model as taught by Skoyles-Greenberg, as both Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg are directed to the system for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model based on both generalized work products and company-specific work products.

Regarding to claim 16, Aycock et al. discloses wherein the system approximates the maturity of the company in view of at least two maturity models (i.e. standards) (column 5, lines 44-47 and 60-65).

19. Claims 13, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,138) in view of Skoyles-Greenberg (World Pub. No. WO 01/25970 A1) and further in view of Baudoin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0010709 A1).

Regarding to claim 13, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg do not explicitly disclose wherein the user interface is a computer comprising a processor, data input means and data viewing means. Baudoin et al. discloses wherein the user interface is a computer comprising a processor (paragraph [0016], lines 3-4), data input means (paragraph [0016], lines 6-7) and data viewing means (i.e. monitor) (paragraph [0016], lines 8-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the user interface is a computer comprising a processor, data input means and data viewing means as taught by Baudoin et al., as Aycock et al., Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. are directed to the method for using a maturity tracing system in order to determine the approximate maturity level of an organization in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine

the maturity level of an organization in view of at least one maturity model on any type of computer.

Regarding to claim 17, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg do not explicitly disclose a user interface for collecting the data, wherein the user interface comprises a processor, data input means and data viewing means. Baudoin et al. discloses a user interface for collecting the data, wherein the user interface comprises a processor (paragraph [0016], lines 3-4), data input means (paragraph [0016], lines 6-7) and data viewing means (i.e. monitor) (paragraph [0016], lines 8-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg with the feature of a user interface for collecting the data, wherein the user interface comprises a processor, data input means and data viewing means as taught by Baudoin et al., as Aycock et al., Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. are directed to the system for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model on any type of computer.

Regarding to claim 18, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Aycock et al. discloses a network connection (i.e. communications network) (column 10, lines 22-23). However, Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg do not explicitly disclose wherein the data input means includes at least one of a keyboard and a port. Baudoin et al. discloses wherein the data input means includes at least one of a keyboard (paragraph [0016], lines 6-8). It is also common knowledge in the prior art for a computer to include a port. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Aycock et al. and Skoyles-Greenberg wherein the data input means includes at least one of a keyboard and a port as taught by

Baudoin et al., as Aycock et al., Skoyles-Greenberg and Baudoin et al. are directed to the system for approximating the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model. The motivation for doing so would have been to approximate the maturity of a company in view of at least one maturity model remotely using a communication network.

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Underwood (U.S. 6,609,128) discloses codes table framework design in an E-commerce architecture.
- Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0033191) discloses a method and apparatus for a product lifecycle management process.
- Krishnan et al., “An Empirical Analysis of Productivity and Quality in Software Products”, Management Science, Vol. 46, No. 6, June 2000, pp. 745-759, discloses life-cycle productivity and conformance quality in software products that includes capability maturity modeling and data analysis software.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS MANSFIELD whose telephone number is (571)270-1904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30 am-6 pm, alt. Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Van Doren can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

18 July 2008
Thomas Mansfield

/Beth Van Doren/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623